

Remarks

This Response accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to continue prosecution of the present application. The Applicant has hereinabove amended pending claims 1, 7-8, 17, 29, and 37.

A final Office Action was mailed October 31, 2008 which rejected all pending claims 1-9, 13-35 and 37-39. Support for the presently amended claims can be found throughout the Specification including FIGS. 5-8 as well as page 26, line 4 to page 2, line 15. The Specification states "*the depth of each adhesive receptacle is less than the distance between the first major surface and the second major surface.*" See Specification, page 28, lines 11-13. Also, the Specification recites, "*e.g., less than the thickness of the overmolded first actuator/coil assembly part.*" See Specification, page 28, lines 12-14.

An advantage of having localized areas of reduced thickness in the overmold material is the ability to greatly increase the stiffness of the interconnection between the overmolded first actuator/coil assembly part and the second actuator/coil assembly part. Furthermore, the localized areas of reduced thickness provide improved stiffness while requiring less adhesive than if the assembly was covered.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that these presently amended claims are merely clarifying in nature and do not narrow or otherwise affect the scope of the claimed subject matter as compared to what was previously presented. The newly presented claims are thus proper, do not introduce new matter, and serve to place the application in proper condition for reconsideration and allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has previously cited several prior art references that are silent, either alone and in combination, with respect to the currently amended subject matter. That is, the previously cited prior art references do not teach or suggest all the limitations contained in the present amendment. Likewise, the cited prior art references fail to provide one skilled in the art with any motivation or desire to combine the references to arrive at the current embodiments of the claimed invention.

As for the cited prior art reference, U.S. Patent No. 5,734,528 to Jabberi et al. (“Jabberi ‘528”), The Examiner has disclaimed that Jabberi ‘528 fails to teach or suggest “forming apertures and subsequently filling the apertures with an adhesive in order to increase a vibrational stiffness response of the actuator and the coil.” See Final Office Action, page 3, lines 3-4. Thus, the current amendments clarifying the configuration and orientation of the adhesive apertures clearly are not rendered unpatentable by the teachings of Jabberi ‘528.

Another cited prior art reference is U.S. Patent No. 5,168,185 to Umehara et al. (“Umehara ‘185”). This reference teaches the covering of an actuator in resin to isolate the position of injection molding flash with the addition of strength to the actuator. The Examiner has cited that the resin can fill apertures resulting from shrinkage in the injection molding. See Final Office Action, page 3, lines 8-13. However, the currently amended language of “*localized areas of reduced thickness*” in the overmolding material cannot be reasonably taught or suggested by the immersion of an actuator in resin.

Indeed, one skilled in the art could not find that shrinkage of a molded component intrinsically or implicitly forms adhesive apertures defined by localized areas of reduced

thickness in the overmolding material, as claimed. In addition, a skilled artisan would not find any reasonable desire or motivation to combine the teaching of completely covering the actuator in resin with any of the cited prior art to arrive at the localized areas of adhesive claimed in the present invention.

A U.S. Patent No. 6,289,577 to Tanaka et al. (“Tanaka ‘577) has also been cited as prior art and fails to render the currently amended claim language unpatentable. Tanaka ‘577 teaches a molding a component with an insert member which is displaced to force resin into contact with multiple plates. However, the Tanaka ‘577 fails to teach or suggest the “*localized areas of reduced thickness*” in the overmolding material due to the application of resin to the component through displacement of an insert member. That is, the insert member is uniform in shape and cannot logically apply the resin to localized areas of reduced thickness while keeping in the spirit of the invention.

Further, the teachings of Tanaka ‘577 cannot be found to reasonably allow the inclusion of localized areas of reduced thickness to accept adhesive due to the use of a fixing member to maintain position of the individual plates. See Tankaka ‘577, col. 2, lines 33-61. Therefore, any need for a localized area of reduced thickness providing an adhesive aperture is negated by the joined fixing member and insert member. As such, one skilled in the art would not find any motivation to use the joined plates of Tanaka ‘577 with any of the other prior art references to arrive at localized areas of reduced thickness in the overmolding material to accept adhesive.

Accordingly, it is believed that the current amendments to the present claims have placed the application in proper condition for allowance over the previously cited prior art references.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application. This Response along with the accompanying RCE are intended to be a complete response to the final Office Action mailed October 31, 2008.

Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below signed Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Tyler J. Mantooth, Registration No. 60,162
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659